

SCOTT N. SCHOOLS (SCBN 9990)
Interim United States Attorney

MARK KROTOSKI (CASBN 138549)
Chief, Criminal Division

DEREK R. OWENS (CASBN 230237)
Special Assistant United States Attorney

450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055
San Francisco, California 94102
Telephone: (415) 436-6488
Fax: (415) 436-7234
derek.owens@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

On February 28, 2007, the parties in this case appeared before the Court for a detention hearing. At that time, the parties requested and the Court agreed to continue the hearing to March 14, 2007. The parties further stipulated that pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure (FRCP) 5.1(d), the time limits set forth in FRCP 5.1(c) be excluded from February 28, 2007, to and including March 15, 2007. The parties agree that – taking into account the public interest in prompt disposition of criminal cases – good cause exists for this extension. Defendant also agrees to exclude for this period of time any time limits applicable under Title 18, United States Code, Section 3161. The parties represented that granting the continuance was the

1 reasonable time necessary for continuity of defense counsel and effective preparation of defense
2 counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).
3 The parties also agreed that the ends of justice served by granting such a continuance
4 outweighed the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. §
5 3161(h)(8)(A).

6 SO STIPULATED:

7 SCOTT N. SCHOOLS
8 Interim United States Attorney

9 /s/ Derek Owens

10 DATED: 3/2/2007

11 DEREK OWENS
12 Special Assistant United States Attorney

13 DATED: 3/14/2007

14 /s/ Gayle Gutekunst

15 GAYLE GUTEKUNST
16 ROBERT M. AMPARAN
17 Attorneys for Enrique Rodriguez

18 For the reasons stated above, the Court finds that an exclusion of time from February 28,
19 2007, to and including March 15, 2007, is warranted and that the ends of justice served by the
20 continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18
21 U.S.C. §3161 (h)(8)(A); FRCP 5.1(d). The failure to grant the requested continuance would
22 deny Mr. Rodriguez continuity of counsel and would deny defense counsel the reasonable time
23 necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would
24 result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).

25 SO ORDERED.

26 DATED: April 6, 2007

